

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 6, 2004, claims 1, 10 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

Record is made of a telephonic phone call between Applicants' attorney Edmond A. DeFrank and Examiner B. Miller on November 2, 2004. The Office Action of August 6, 2004, the cited references and the pending claims were mentioned. A proposed amendment modifying the independent claims was mentioned during the call. The above amendments to the claims reflect the topic mentioned during the call made by the Applicants' attorney.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Raff in view of Kruglikov. Next, the Office Action rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Raff in view of Kruglikov and Serbinis.

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The claimed invention includes creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer, wherein the managed computer system does not have a keyboard and display. Next, the configuration profile is transferred to the electronic mobile handheld device and then the managed computer system is configured by connecting the electronic mobile handheld device to the managed computer system and transferring the configuration profile.

In contrast, Raff in combination with either Kruglikov or with Kruglikov and Serbinis do not disclose all of the Applicants' claimed features. For example, the combined cited references do not disclose the managed computer system without a keyboard and display. In fact, the Raff reference teaches away from the Applicants' claims because Raff clearly discloses a keyboard and display associated with the computer that is synchronized with the handheld PDA (see Abstract and FIG. 1 of Raff). Thus, the combination of the references discloses a keyboard and display associated with the synchronized computer, unlike the Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, the combined references cannot render the claims obvious. This teaching away and

failure of the cited reference to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2143).

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the subject application are in immediate condition for allowance. Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly request the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: December 6, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX